DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 622 FL 013 941

AUTHOR Elkhatib, Ahmed Shafik
TITLE Toward a Descriptive Rhetoric of the ESL Paragraph.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Higher Education; *Paragraph Composition; *Writing (Composition); Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

Several English as a second language (ESL) expository compositions written by four Arab college freshman students majoring in English are analyzed. The analysis is intended to describe intersentence structural relationships. Sixty-nine percent of the sentences the students wrote were coordinate sentences. There was no correlation between verbal ability or comprehension level and the percentage of coordinate sentences each student wrote. Topic sentences were not restricted to the initial position in the paragraph. Whether the students' use of coordination between sentences was attributable to transfer from their native language or merely their lack of experience as writers, the result was that they employed a rhetorical strategy which failed to produce acceptable writing in English. It is suggested that ESL students should be taught how to determine what sentences they should subordinate and why. Students should begin by examining some well written paragraphs containing intersentence structural relationships. Then they can produce single sentences and practice adding additional, linked sentences. It is also necessary to familiarize ESL students with such concepts as paragraph unity and coherence. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ahmed Elkhatib

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED234622

TOWARD A DESCRIPTIVE RHETORIC OF THE ESL PARAGRAPH

Ahmed Shafik Elkhatib

Teachers College, Columbia University

1983

I. Introduction

The analysis of paragraphs and essays written by ESL students has unduly been neglected.[1] This neglect may be attributed to several factors which have until recently led to a similar, yet less severe, neglect of the study of paragraphs written by English-speaking students. One of these factors is the fact that while sentence theory dates back to Greco-Roman rhetoric, paragraph theory did not emerge until 1866.[2] Another factor is that most linguists since Bloomfield until transformational generativists have considered the sentence to be the largest grammatically relevant unit.[3] The third factor lies in the fact that paragraph rhetoric has undergone considerable languish since the turn of the century and that as recently as the sixties, "discussions of units other than the paragraph can scarcely be said to have begun."[4] Fortunately, an "auspicious

FL013941

---

[1]In this article, ESL (English as a Second Language) is intended to cover both ESL and EFL (English as a Foreign Language).

[2]For the first systematic formulation of paragraph theory, see Alexander Bain, English Composition and Rhetoric: A Manual, 4th ed. (New York: Longmans, 1908). The book was first published in 1866, however. For an account of the development of paragraph theory, see Edwin Herbert Lewis, The History of the English Paragraph (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1899).

[3]Notable exceptions are tagmemicists like Kenneth L. Pike, Richard E. Young, and Alton L. Becker.

[4]Paul C. Rodgers, Jr., "Symposium on the Paragraph," CCC, XVII (1966), 72. Henceforward "Symposium" will be used.

start"[5] for paragraph rhetoric and some attempts at essay theory have taken place and are still going on. This start or rather re-start is reinforced by increasing concern on the part of linguists with the analysis and description of units beyond the sentence. Unfortunately, however, the field of ESL has not yet witnessed a comparable start or interest.

II. The Purpose of the Paper

The purpose of this paper is to report on the analysis of several ESL expository compositions written by four college freshman students majoring in English.[6] The analysis is intended to describe inter-sentence structural relationships (mainly in terms of coordination and subordination). The findings of the analysis will then be examined in relation to rhetorical

---

[5] Francis Christensen, "Symposium," 60.

[6] The subjects were enrolled as first-year students at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt in the academic year 1981-82. Their native language is Arabic. The four students were chosen from among some fifty students on the basis of their English proficiency and their writing apprehension level. English proficiency was determined by administering "Comprehensive Test 3," English Alfa, Book 1, Teacher's Edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1980). Writing apprehension level was determined by administering an instrument developed by John A. Daly and Michael D. Miller, "The Empirical Development of an Instrument to Measure Writing Apprehension," Research in the Teaching of English, 9 (1975), 242-249.

The students' names used in this paper are fictitious. AYMAN (high proficiency; low apprehension) scored 75 out of a hundred (proficiency) and 111 (apprehension). EHAB (high proficiency; high apprehension) scored 68 and 97 respectively. WALEED (low proficiency; low apprehension) scored 41 and 87 respectively. The fourth student, HAMĀDA (low proficiency; high apprehension), scored 42 and 79 respectively. (In the Daly-Miller instrument, the higher the score the less the apprehension.)

The number of essays analyzed here is 17 and these contain 189 T-units (some 3117 words). Before analyzing the writings, I had to divide them into T-units (the shortest grammatically terminable unit). This was made absolutely necessary in view of poor punctuation.

acceptability of English paragraphs as well as in the light of linguistic relativity hypothesis. Finally some implications for the teaching of writing to ESL students will be briefly discussed.

III. Method of Analysis

The method of analysis employed to determine inter-sentence structural relationships is essentially a modification and expansion of Francis Christensen's model as described in his classic article "A Generative Rhetoric of the Paragraph."[7] Some other supplementary criteria are also used.

As a starting point for the discussion of Christensen's approach, I will present a rearrangement and a grouping of his nine principles into three categories. The categories have been assigned names for easy reference. The categories and principles are:

The structural relationship of coordination and subordination:

- The paragraph may be defined as a sequence of structurally related sentences.
- Simple sequences are of two sorts--coordinate and subordinate.
- The two sorts of sequence combine to produce the commonest sort--the mixed sequence.

---

[7] In Francis Christen and Bonnijean Christensen, Notes Toward a New Rhetoric (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), 74-103. The article was first published in CCC, XVI (1965), 144-156. The book version is used here since it has the added advantage of some sort of a preface in addition to a "postscript" which resulted from discussions by Pecker, Rodgers, Miles, and Karrfalt in the "Symposium."

It is to be noted that although the students supposedly wrote "essays" or "compositions," I decided to do a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis since their "essays" seriously lacked unity and coherence. Often what the students ended up writing was paragraphs.

The topic sentence:

- The top sentence of the sequence is the topic sentence.
- The topic sentence is nearly always the first sentence of the sequence.
- Some paragraphs have no top, no topic, sentence.

Out-of-sequence sentences, illogical paragraphing, and paragraph punctuation:

- Some paragraphs have sentences at the beginning or at the end that do not belong to the sequence.
- Some paragraphing is illogical.
- Punctuation should be by the paragraph, not by the sentence.

The following discussion of the principles is intended not as a criticism of Christensen's theory but rather as a rationalizatin of the modification and expansion of his method of analysis in an attempt to render it more appropriate for the analysis of ESL paragraphs.

A. The structural relationships of coordination and subordination

By a sequence of structurally related sentences, Christensen means a group of sentences related to one another by either coordination or subordination, or most commonly, by a combination of both. To these two types of relationships which may be called "vertical," Karrfalt adds a "horizontal" dimension which he calls "structural addition by completion."[8] Karrfalt's characterization of these three relationships is adopted in the present paper since it explicitly and concisely defines these types of

---

[8]David H. Karrfalt, "The Generation of Paragraphs and Larger Units," CCC, XIX (1968), 211-17.

structure. Preferring to call these relationships "structural addition by subordination," "structural addition by coordination," and "structural addition by completion," Karrfalt defines their basic characteristics as follows:

1. Structural addition by subordination

- The added sentence is at a lower level of generality than that of the preceding sentence.
- The added sentence is added merely to the preceding sentence--or, more likely, to a portion of that sentence.

2. Structural addition by coordination

- The added sentence is at the same level of generality as the preceding sentence.
- The added sentence and the preceding sentence both have the same relationships to another sentence (or unit)[9] in the paragraph at a higher or lower level of generality.

3. Structural addition by completion

- The added sentence is at a higher level of generality than that of the preceding sentence and that of all preceding sentences taken together as a unit.
- The added sentence is added to all the preceding sentences as a unit.

It may be a good idea to diagram Karrfalt's definitions in Figure 1 as follows:

---

[9]By "unit" Karrfalt means two or more sentences taken together.

	Generality Level of Added Sentence vs. Preceding Sentence(s)	The Sentence is Added to
Subordination	LOWER	PRECEDING SENTENCE
Coordination	SAME	BOTH ADDED AND PRECEDING SENTENCES HAVE SAME RELATION TO A HIGHER/LOWER SENTENCE/UNIT
Completion	HIGHER	ALL PRECEDING SENTENCES

Figure 1. Karrfalt's Criteria for Determining Inter-sentence Structural Relationships

The general criteria outlined above are supplemented by the following criterion that was suggested by Larson's discussion of the meaning "roles" sentences play in paragraphs.[10] Larson notes that

> quite often two or more sentences in the paragraph will exemplify, particularize, describe, narrate, support, or refute....Successive sentences that fill the roles just named, especially those that exemplify or particularize, are likely to form what Professor Christensen calls a "coordinate sequence." The other [eleven] roles I have listed are less likely to be repeated in successive sentences, though they may be repeated; sentences that play those roles are more likely to participate in what Christensen calls a "subordinate sequence."[11]

---

[10] Richard L. Larson, "Sentences in Action: A Technique for Analyzing Paragraphs," CCC, XVIII (1967), 16-22.

[11] Ibid., 17. Larson lists seventeen roles of which he has mentioned six as those likely to form a coordinate sequence.

Realizing the difficulty inherent in applying a criterion based solely on meaning, I am using Larson's remark in conjunction with Christensen's and Karrfalt's criteria mainly to tip the scale one way or the other whenever it is difficult to classify a certain sentence. Christensen admits: "Often I am not sure that I can say of a given sentence that it is one or the other," meaning either coordinate or subordinate.[12] However, for the purpose of this paper, the criteria proved adequate in view of the relative simplicity of the ESL compositions analyzed here.

B. The topic sentence

In asserting that the topic sentence is "nearly always the first sentence" in a paragraph, Christensen, continuing a deductive, prescriptive "rule" of Bain's, dismisses the high level sentences that appear at the end of paragraphs as "usually extrasequential and thus conclusions or preparation for the next paragraph."[13] He further notes that those high-level sentences that appear on the way down in the paragraph are sometimes subtopic sentences, or exceptions to the principle that succeeding sentences are at a lower level of generality.[14]

Although Rodgers makes the point that "extended synthetic movement...is fairly uncommon in written discourse,"[15] he hastens to modify his statement in the "Symposium" in the immediately following issue of CCC. He declares

---

[12] "Symposium," 62.

[13] Ibid., 65.

[14] Ibid., 65-66.

[15] Paul C. Rodgers, Jr., "A Discourse-centered Rhetoric of the Paragraph," CCC, XVII (1966), 5.

that "synthesis does occur, and certainly occurs often enough to warrant attention."[16] Also Young and Becker allow for the occurrence of the topic sentence at the end of a paragraph especially at the beginning and end of essays.[17] The topic sentence may also be repeated at the end of the paragraph.[18]

C. Out-of-sequence sentences and illogical paragraphing

To determine if a certain sentence was out-of-sequence, the following criteria were used:

1. Repetition: In addition to Larson's general criterion of clear relationship of each sentence in a paragraph to the first sentence,[19] a more specific criterion developed by Flothow and Littleton was used. According to them, every sentence "must report, directly or indirectly, a particle of or the total idea of the preceding sentences"[20] and that not even two short sentences may be linked unless they repeat at least part of

---

[16]Rodgers, "Symposium," 77.

[17]Alton L. Becker, "A Tagmemic Approach to Paragraph Analysis," CCC, XVI (1965), 240; Richard E. Young and Alton L. Becker, "Toward a Modern Theory of Rhetoric: A Tagmemic Contribution," Harvard Educational Review, 35 (1965), 465.

[18]Both Rodgers ("Discourse-centered...," 2) and Alexander E. Jones and Claude W. Faulkner (Writing Good Prose, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961, p. 73) make the point that some paragraphs have no explicit topic sentence.

[19]By "first sentence," Larson apparently means the topic sentence without naming it.

[20]Rudolph Flothow and Oscar E. Littleton, Structure and Strategy in Composition (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), 57. Quoted in Vivian Josephine Horn, "An Analysis of Certain Structural and Lexical Signals Used to Express Relationships Between Sentences in Paragraphs" (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968), 35-36.

the same idea.[21] Repetition, according to Jones and Faulkner, may be achieved by (1) the same word, (2) a synonym (e.g., automobile, car), (3) a class-member concept (e.g., lilac, flowering shrub), and (4) a whole-part concept (e.g., engine, car).[22] In the present analysis, if a following sentence failed to show a partial or total repetition, it was judged as out-of-sequence.

2. Lexical equivalence chains: Young and Becker's concept of "lexical equivalence chains" was also used to identify out-of-sequence sentences. Becker points out that a paragraph has, in addition to its system of functional parts, two other structural features, namely, continuity or concord between the parts, and a system of semantic relationships.[23] He further points out that the lexical markers of paragraphs are of two sorts,

---

[21] Flothow and Littleton give the following example in which the numbers indicate the four elements communicated by the sentence:

1 2 3 4 4
I broke my arm when I was twelve.

One of the four parts of the sentence must be repeated in the following sentence; without such repetition there can be no transition. They then offer four possibilities of succeeding sentences. The number preceding a sentence indicates the element repeated.

1. I was always having accidents.
2. Breaking bones was my earliest specialty.
3. The arm has been stronger ever since.
4. That was the year I first met an orthopedic surgeon.

These four sentences all build upon subjects derived from the original sentence. Succeeding sentences may follow from these or from the original sentence. Quoted in Horn, 35-36.

[22] Op. cit., 4-6.

[23] Becker, "Tagmemic Approach," 238.

equivalence classes and lexical transitions.[24]

The Marking System

For the purposes of the present analysis, the following marking system is used:

1. Sentences, or rather T-units, are arranged on separate lines on the page.

2. A sentence is placed parallel to the preceding sentence(s) if it is coordinate with it/them.

3. A sentence is indented if it is subordinate to the preceding sentence.

4. A sentence is outdented if it "completes" the preceding sentences taken together as a unit.

5. On the left-hand margin an Arabic numberal indicates the structural relationship or the level of generality of the sentence.

6. Underlining is used throughout a paragraph to mark the basic lexical equivalence chains. Solid underlining points backward, i.e., to the preceding sentence(s), while broken underlining points forward, i.e., to the following sentence(s).

To show how this method of analysis works, an example paragraph written by WALEED is given in the Appendix.

---

[24] Ibid., 241. In this paper, we are concerned with only equivalence classes.

IV. Results of the Analysis

A. Structural relationships

Paragraph-by-paragraph analysis was conducted on each composition each student wrote. The percentage of coordinate sentences was calculated for each paragraph individually, then for each composition as a unit. A mean percentage was calculated for all the compositions each student wrote.

The mean percentages of coordinate sentences written by the four students were as follows: AYMAN 83%, EHAB 58%, WALEED 57%, and HAMĀDA 77%. The total mean of coordination for all four students was 69% (i.e., with only 31% subordination). No examples of the structural relationship of completion were found.

These results may be tabulated as follows:

Writing Apprehension	Verbal Ability: High	Verbal Ability: Low
High	EHAB English Proficiency: 68 Apprehension Level: 97 Coordination: 58%	HAMĀDA 42 79 77%
Low	AYMAN 75 111 83%	WALEED 41 87 57%
Mean % of coordination = 69%		

Table 1. Summary of Findings

The arrows in the table are intended to point out the fact that there was no correlation between verbal ability or apprehension level and the percentage of coordinate sentences each student wrote. EHAB (high proficiency; high apprehension) and WALEED (low proficiency; low apprehension) wrote almost the same percentage of coordinate T-units: 58% and 57% respectively. Also AYMAN (high proficiency; low apprehension) and HAMĀDA (low proficiency; high apprehension) were close enough in the percentage of their coordinate T-units: 83% and 77% respectively. This lack of correlation shows that the degree to which a student employs coordination rather than subordination is not as much tied to verbal ability or apprehension level as it is to the rhetorical strategy the students are employing. The question poses itself: What is the origin or cause of this strategy? This is what section V below will attempt to answer.

B. Topic sentences, out-of-sequence sentences, and illogical paragraphing

The analysis revealed that topic sentences were not restricted to initial position in the paragraph. In fact they were found everywhere and were often repeated (or restated) either in the immediately following sentence or later in the paragraph.

Christensen's statements that some paragraphs have out-of-sequence sentences at the beginning or at the end and that some paragraphing is illogical proved to be true or even a characteristic of the student writing in question. Moreover, the position of these out-of-sequence sentences was not restricted to the beginning or end of paragraphs; in fact they could be found anywhere in the paragraph. Also, such sentences were not necessarily or clearly introductions, transitions, or conclusions as in the case of

Christensen's example paragraphs K, L, and M.[25]

To borrow an expression from Coleridge through Christensen, the analysis showed that most of the paragraphs the students wrote could be described as "a handful of marbles in a bag," as Coleridge put it in criticizing some of the writing of his day;[26] or, to borrow an expression from Carlyle through Jones and Faulkner, as a "bag of duckshot" rather than a "beaten ingot."[27] In other words, the paragraphing habits of the students were far from being systematic or logical. One-paragraph "essays" were not uncommon, nor were one-sentence paragraphs.

V. Discussion of the Results of Structural Relationships

If we bear in mind that "simple sequences, especially coordinate ones, are not common"[28] in English paragraphs, and that dependence on coordination in writing is a characteristic of "children and educationally deprived individuals"[29] and that subordination is "an assumed mark of linguistic maturity generally accepted by the community of [English] speakers,"[30] the students, with 69% coordinate sentences, are in a clear disadvantage. And since the results have not revealed any significant correlation between the

---

[25] "Generative Rhetoric," in Notes, 95-96.

[26] "Symposium," 63.

[27] Op. cit., v. Thomas Carlyle was commenting on Emerson's Essays, First Series.

[28] Christensen, "Generative Rhetoric" in Notes, 85.

[29] Robert B. Kaplan, "Contrastive Rhetoric and the Teaching of Composition," TESOL Quarterly, I (1967), 12.

[30] Kaplan, "A Further Note on Contrastive Rhetoric," Communication Quarterly, 24 (1979), 18.

extent to which each student used coordination and his verbal ability or writing apprehension level, the question as to why the students wrote coordinate sequences almost poses itself.

Kaplan's answer to this question may take the form that rhetoric is tied to the linguistic system of a particular language and that

> the organization of a 'paragraph,' written in any language by an individual who is not a native speaker of that language, will carry the dominant imprint of this individual's culturally-coded orientation to the phenomenological world in which he lives and which he is bound to interpret largely through the [syntactic and semantic] avenues available to him in his native language.[31]

Although the findings of the present analysis may seem to support Kaplan's assumptions on rhetorical preferences for coordination and parallelism in Arabic, I find it necessary to exercise some caution in accepting the present results as a "proof" of negative transfer from the students' native language at the rhetorical level. Further investigation is needed before such an assertion can confidently be made. The reasons for caution are various. Some of these reasons are discussed as follows:

(1) The concept of "contrastive rhetoric" as developed by Kaplan is based on a modificatin of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. The modification (or rather "weakening" or toning down) of the controversial hypothesis was intended to avoid the problems inherent in the principle of linguistic relativity (i.e., that the world is differently conceived in different language communities) and in linguistic determinism (i.e., that language causes these differences). In this respect, we should remember that many

---

[31]Kaplan, The Anatomy of Rhetoric: Prolegomena to a Functional Theory of Rhetoric (Philadelphia, PA: The Center for Curriculum Development, Inc., 1972), 1. Kaplan bases his assumption on the analysis of some 600 student papers, 126 of which are written by Arabic-speaking students.

psychoanthropological studies refute such causal relationship and only partially support the relativistic aspect. For that matter, consider Carroll's statement that "we may be well advised to abandon the notion that languages impose world-views on their speakers or that a language tends to reflect a world view of its own."[32]

(2) Although Kaplan cites some studies which indicate that his "primary assumption appears to hae survived analysis,"[33] there are also some other studies which do not. For example, Santiago, who examined inter-sentence logical relationships in Spanish and English paragraphs written by Spanish-speaking students, came to the conclusion that "the facts do not support the contention that the patterns of logical relations employed by the students when writing in Spanish and English differed significantly."[34] Santiago's analyses which were based on several factors all yielded negative results. However, some minor differences were found in the number and arrangement of some of the logical relationships. Santiago then points out that differences may turn up with different student populations or different techniques of analysis.[35]

(3) Although the rhetorics associated with English and Arabic (the students' native language) are generally thought to be totally different, a

---

[32]John B. Carroll, "Linguistic Relativity, Contrastive Linguistics, and Language Learning," IRAL, I (1963), 11.

[33]"Further Note," 12.

[34]Ramón Luis Santiago, "A Contrastive Analysis of Some Rhetorical Aspects in the Writing in Spanish and English of Spanish-Speaking College Students in Puerto Rico" (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1970), 101.

[35]Ibid., 105.

closer examination of the history of classical rhetoric (from which English rhetoric descends) and its development as well as Arabic rhetorical theory reveals some contact and possible similarity.[36] If similarity ever existed, then the rhetorical strategy employed by the students in question cannot be solely traceable to transfer from their mother tongue.

(4) Examining scores of works on Arabic rhetoric, I failed to find any explicitly stated preference for coordination over subordination. Hardly anything was said about inter-sentence relationships, with the exception of a discussion of when it is recommended to join two sentences with the coordinating conjunction /wa/ 'and,' for the purpose of avoiding ambiguity. However, it should be noted that Arabic seems to be more tolerant of parallelism and prolixity (with certain constraints) than English generally is.

The discussion above, however, should not be taken to mean that I am excluding negative transfer from the students' native language as a potential reason for writing excessive coordinate sequences of sentences. The points mentioned above only make me reserve judgment as to such transfer until research on rhetorical patterns or preferences in Arabic paragraphs (and for that matter, other languages) is done, and also until research on

---

[36] See Allen H. Merriam, "Rhetoric and the Islamic Tradition," Today's Speech, 22 (1974), 43-49. Merriam makes the point that "the development of Islamic [or Arabic] rhetorical theory seemed to share much in common with the Greco-Roman tradition. For example, both systems enjoyed a firm basis in the theoretical writings of Aristotle. Both experienced the growth of a stylistic orientation to rhetoric. And just as Arabic language and diction developed within a religious context, so Western theory has, since the time of St. Augustine, placed a strong emphasis on preaching and Biblical style" (pp. 46-47).

inter-sentence relationships of the writings of English-speaking "basic writers" is conducted.

V. Implications for Teaching Writing to ESL Students

Whether or not the students' use of coordination between sentences may be attributable to transfer from their native language, or just to their lack of experience as writers, the fact remains that the students employ a rhetorical strategy which does not result in acceptable writing in English, and that they produce paragraphs seriously lacking in coherence. The question I am attempting to suggest a brief answer to in this section is: What can ESL teachers do about these two problems of student writing?

A. Coordination and subordination

Concerning the problem of coordination and subordination, paragraph structure in English should be taught to ESL students side by side with syntactic patterns. If it is desirable in English to relate certain sentences in terms of subordination, ESL students should be taught how to determine what sentences they should subordinate and why. ESL teachers may make use of Christensen's suggestion that they teach their students "the addition of subordinate sentences to clarify and of coordinate sentences to emphasize or enumerate."[37]

Gradation is highly recommended in this respect. ESL students should start with examining some well-written paragraphs in terms of their inter-sentence structural relationships, and the fact should be made explict to them that essentially subordinate sequences are generally considered more

---

[37] "Generative Rhetoric," in Notes, 85.

acceptable rhetorically. Moving from examination to production, students may try their hands with just one sentence to which they practice adding another sentence according to either the principle of coordination or subordination. As they progress, students practice adding more sentences until they gain some confidence in writing paragraphs.

B. Out-of sequence sentences, illogical paragraphing, and paragraph punctuation

Another implication of the present study is the necessity of familiarizing ESL students with such concepts as paragraph unity and coherence. Students should be trained to avoid writing out-of-sequence students. This can be achieved by giving them some practice in identifying such sentences in their own writing, and in observing how sentences are closely-related to one another in well-written paragraphs and compositions. The techniques for repetition and lexical equivalence chains used in identifying non-sequential sentences (see III.C above) may be used by the students to check the coherence of their paragraphs. The concept of logical or meaning relationships among all sentences in a paragraph may also be used in the classroom, first as an identification exercise, then as a checking device to be applied by the students to their own writing. And when ESL students achieve reasonable progress in avoiding out-of-sequence sentences and in ensuring "logical" relationships among sentences in paragraphs, the problems of illogical paragraphing and one-sentence paragraphs will largely take care of themselves.

VI. Conclusion

As a concluding remark, I quote Carroll who asserts that "an individual learning a second language must be taught to observe and codify experience

as nearly as possible in the same way as native speakers of that language."[38] This assertion brings in the cultural dimension to teaching ESL students to write in English. And for that matter, let's consider Rivers's statement that foreign-language learners should advance steadily in "understanding the life and ways of thought of the people who speak the language."[39] In other words, ESL students should in a sense communicate on the other fellow's terms, or as Kaplan puts it, should "see the world through English-colored glasses"[40]--a formidable task for both ESL teachers and students as well. But the task has simply to be done.

---

[38] Op. cit., 17.

[39] Wilga M. Rivers, The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), 159.

[40] "Contrastive Rhetoric," 16.

APPENDIX*

1 I am thankful my parents they did their best to make me grow up in good conditions.

2 They gave me all that I need so far.

2 They did not save any effort to me.

1 It is a matter of fact that everyone loves his parents.

1 But everyone wants to be a good person in society.

2 So I would like to be a doctor.

3 This job is completely differ from my father job.

3 My mother was not work like their day's institution.

2 I like to be a doctor to take care the sick people and give a hand to anyone who needs a help.

2 If you want to be better than your grandfather it does not mean that you are rejecting their way in life.

3 No.

1 But if everyone wanted to be like his father, there will not be progress in our society because our parents days were unlike ours.

2 Their codes and institutions is different from nowadays ideas.

2 But we must keep the good old ideas and improve it.

2 It does not mean to concentrate on the past.

2 But we must take the progressive ideas and let the bad habits which come from the foreign countries, the novelties which our youth put it before their sight as a guide.

3 It is a bad thing to find our youth untaught like apes.

3 Father must advise them and teach them the values which every young man must know it to be a good person in society.

---

*This composition, written by WALEED, is in response to an assignment to write about the ways in which he expects his life to be different from his parents.